

## **REMARKS**

This is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 26, 2008. Claims 1-15 and 40-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 10-14, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application publication 2002/0162093 to Zhou et al. Claims 8, 9, 15 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0162093 in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,260,628 to Yamamoto et al. The assignee traverses the rejection of these claims. The assignee hereby request reconsideration of this application in view of the remarks that follow.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### **Zhou et al. (US publication No. 2002/0162093)**

Zhou et al. (US publication No. 2002/0162093) is directed to a server system wherein “during runtime, requests from different locales can be served locale-sensitive responses by retrieving the source code and dynamically populating it with the appropriate content for the target locale.” (Abstract). The server in advance of any request for content “internationalizes an application authored for one locale for use in other locales. The system automatically extracts locale-sensitive content from the source code and other locale-independent elements. The extracted content can then be translated for use in other locales.” (Abstract).

#### **Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,260,628)**

Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,260,628) is directed to a “heterogeneous network includes network related hardware and software products from a plurality of vendors. The network includes a storage system configured to store data, a server configured to process requests, a switch coupling the storage system and the server for data communication, and a

network manager including an event dictionary to interpret an event message received from a device experiencing failure.” (Abstract).

### **Claims 1-10**

The claims of the present application are fundamentally different from the applied references. In contrast to Zhou et al., independent claim 1 (and the claims dependent thereon) is directed to a “method of operation in a hand-held electronic device.” Zhou et al. does not address, teach or disclose operation in a hand-held device. Zhou et al. is directed to pre-processing source code at a server and does not address a handheld device making modifications locally at the hand-held device to character sequences entered by the user of the handheld device.

First, Zhou fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, as required by claim 1, the following five (5) steps that the hand-held electronic device is required to perform:

(1) a hand-held electronic device “requesting from the enterprise server or gateway localized resources for use with an application on the hand-held electronic device”

(2) a hand-held electronic device “receiving via the wireless connection a resource bundle from the enterprise server or gateway”

(3) a hand-held device “identifying a character sequence entered by a user of the hand-held electronic device that matches a predetermined sequence associated with the current locale of the hand-held device”

(4) a hand-held device “choosing an article for use with a word that is entered by the user after the character sequence is entered, wherein the article is grammatically correct for the language associated with the current locale” or

(5) a hand-held device “automatically replacing the character sequence with the article.”

Second, Zhou et al. fails to disclose or suggest “choosing an article for use with a word that is entered by the user after the character sequence is entered, wherein the article is

grammatically correct for the language associated with the current locale” as required by claim 1 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Third, Zhou et al. fails to disclose or suggest “automatically replacing the character sequence with the article” as required by claim 1 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Fourth, Zhou et al. fails to disclose or suggest “the enterprise server or gateway requests the localized resources from the remotely located origin server and the origin server transmits a resource bundle containing localized resources to the enterprise server or gateway” as required by claim 1. Zhou et al. fails to disclose or suggest the use of a “remotely located origin server.”

Yamamoto et al. also fails to make up for these deficiencies in Zhou et al. Consequently, claim 1 cannot be rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon (claims 2-10) are allowable and should proceed to issue.

### **Claims 11, 40-42**

Similarly, claim 11 cannot be rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Claim 11 requires steps performed by the hand-held device that are not disclosed by Zhou et al.

First, Zhou et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest, as required by claim 11, the following five (5) steps that require performance by the hand-held electronic device:

(1) “receiving a request for localized resources from the hand-held electronic device”

(2) “transmitting to the hand-held electronic device via the wireless connection a resource bundle from the enterprise server or gateway that comprises at least some of the requested localized resources”

(3) “the hand-held electronic device can identify a character sequence entered by a user of the hand-held electronic device that matches a predetermined sequence associated with the current locale of the hand-held device”

(4) the hand-held electronic device can “choose an article for use with a word that is entered by the user after the character sequence is entered, wherein the article is grammatically correct for the language associated with the current locale” or

(5) the hand-held electronic device can “automatically replace the character sequence with the article.”

Second, Zhou et al. does not disclose or suggest, “identify a character sequence entered by a user of the hand-held electronic device that matches a predetermined sequence associated with the current locale of the hand-held device” as required by claim 11 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Third, Zhou et al. does not disclose or suggest, “choose an article for use with a word that is entered by the user after the character sequence is entered, wherein the article is grammatically correct for the language associated with the current locale” as required by claim 11 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Fourth, Zhou et al. does not disclose or suggest, “automatically replace the character sequence with the article” as required by claim 11 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Yamamoto et al. also fails to make up for these deficiencies in Zhou et al. Consequently, claim 11 cannot be rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Accordingly, claim 11 and the claims dependent thereon (claims 40-42) are allowable and should proceed to issue.

## Claims 12-15

Similarly, claim 12 cannot be rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Claim 12 requires steps performed by the hand-held device that are not disclosed by Zhou et al.

First, Zhou et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest, as required by claim 12, the following four (4) steps that require performance by the hand-held electronic device:

- (1) “receiving a request for localized resources from the hand-held electronic device”
- (2) “transmitting to the hand-held electronic device via the wireless connection a resource bundle from the enterprise server or gateway that comprises at least some of the requested localized resources”
- (3) “the hand-held electronic device can determine that the usage of an article associated with a word is grammatically incorrect in the current locale of the hand-held device after a user of the hand-held electronic device enters a sequence of characters that includes the article and the word” or
- (4) “the hand-held electronic device automatically replaces the incorrectly used article with a grammatically correct article for the current locale.”

Second, Zhou et al. does not disclose or suggest, determine that the usage of an article associated with a word is grammatically incorrect in the current locale of the hand-held device after a user of the hand-held electronic device enters a sequence of characters that includes the article and the word” as required by claim 12 since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Third, Zhou et al. does not disclose or suggest, “automatically replaces the incorrectly used article with a grammatically correct article for the current locale” as required by claim 12

since Zhou et al. discloses internationalizing an application authored for one locale for use in other locales prior to runtime and not during runtime after the user enters character sequences.

Yamamoto et al. also fails to make up for these deficiencies in Zhou et al. Consequently, claim 12 cannot be rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Accordingly, claim 12 and the claims dependent thereon (claims 13-15) are allowable and should proceed to issue

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is believed that claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If any further action by the assignee is necessary, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the assignee's attorney at the phone number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due with this response to Jones Day Deposit Account #501432, reference 555255-012724.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY  
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: December 18, 2008

By:   
F. Drexel Feeling (Reg. No. 40,602)

North Point  
901 Lakeside Ave.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7199